

Message

---

**From:** Huetteman, Tom [Huetteman.Tom@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 10/5/2015 2:17:33 PM  
**To:** Armann, Steve [Armann.Steve@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Re: CONFIDENTIAL Attorney Client Work Product - draft PCB Data Summary

Good to have. The treatment of the outlier needs discussion. Is an outlier among a data set with pretty wide spacing so to me it can't be dismissed or treated in isolation.

Tom Huetteman, Assistant Director  
Land Division, EPA Region 9  
415-972-3751

On Oct 5, 2015, at 7:02 AM, Armann, Steve <[Armann.Steve@epa.gov](mailto:Armann.Steve@epa.gov)> wrote:

Steven S. Armann, Manager  
Corrective Action Office (LND-4-1)  
USEPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Phone: 415-972-3352  
Fax: 415-947-3533  
Email: [armann.steve@epa.gov](mailto:armann.steve@epa.gov)

---

**From:** ZIFF, SARA  
**Sent:** Friday, October 02, 2015 9:01 AM  
**To:** Armann, Steve; Wilson, Patrick; Baylor, Katherine  
**Subject:** FW: CONFIDENTIAL Attorney Client Work Product - draft PCB Data Summary

---

**From:** Tasnif-abbasi, Maryam@DTSC [<mailto:Maryam.Tasnif-abbasi@dtsc.ca.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 02, 2015 8:02 AM  
**To:** ZIFF, SARA  
**Subject:** FW: CONFIDENTIAL Attorney Client Work Product - draft PCB Data Summary

Thanks!  
Maryam  
(714) 222 3485

---

**From:** Jeng, Cy@DTSC  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 01, 2015 4:56 PM  
**To:** Alasti, Isabella@DTSC  
**Cc:** Lofstrom, Dot@DTSC; Tasnif-abbasi, Maryam@DTSC; Neal, Greg@DTSC  
**Subject:** RE: CONFIDENTIAL Attorney Client Work Product - draft PCB Data Summary

Here are the tables.

---

**From:** Jeng, Cy@DTSC  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 01, 2015 4:55 PM  
**To:** Alasti, Isabella@DTSC  
**Cc:** Lofstrom, Dot@DTSC; Tasnif-abbasi, Maryam@DTSC; Neal, Greg@DTSC  
**Subject:** CONFIDENTIAL Attorney Client Work Product - draft PCB Data Summary

Attached are draft risk tables for post-cleanup PCB soil results. The data were grouped into four different decision units: proposed residential lots, proposed development area (including roadways), non-development areas (including Jurupa Ave), and the entire Ag Park property. Both surface (0-2 ft) and subsurface (0-10 ft) soil data were used to calculate 95%UCL concentrations for each decision unit. Then, the corresponding cancer risks were estimated for resident exposure to surface soil and worker exposure to subsurface soil.

Table 1 shows the results using all post-cleanup data collected by DTSC, and Table 2 are based on the data sets without the highest outlier (18.2 mg/kg at B4-surface). The following is a quick summary of the risk results for the various scenarios:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->For future residents, the estimated cancer risk for exposure to surface soil in proposed residential lots is approximately  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ . The estimated risk is only slightly higher ( $1.3 \times 10^{-6}$ ) when potential exposure to surface soil in the entire development area (including roadways) is assumed.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->For exposure to subsurface soil by workers, the cancer risks are  $2 \times 10^{-7}$  in proposed residential lots and approximately  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  in the entire development area. These risks were estimated using the industrial RSL (0.97 mg/kg for high risk PCB), which assumes long-term exposures (8 hours/day, 250 days/year, and 25 years). Thus, the risks should be even lower for occasional contact to deep soil by landscape/construction workers.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->For non-development areas and the Ag Park property, the estimated residential risks for exposure to surface soil are  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  and  $7 \times 10^{-6}$ , respectively. The estimated worker risks for exposure to subsurface soil are  $4 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $2 \times 10^{-6}$ , respectively. They are driven by the elevated concentration detected at B4-surface (18.2 mg/kg). When this outlier was removed, all estimated risks are at or below  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  as shown on Table 2 (note that the results for residential lots and development area are the same as those in Table 1, as B-4 is located outside the proposed development).

Maryam, please forward this information to EPA so they can review it before the call.

Please let me know if any questions.

CY

<UCL\_Summary.pdf>